

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is now being requested. Claims 1-6, 8-14 and 16-18 are now in this application. Claims 1 and 9 have been amended. Claims 7 and 15 have been canceled.

Claims 1, 6, 8-9, 14 and 16-18 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson in view of Katz. Applicant respectfully traverses. Claims 1 and 9 have been amended. Specifically, claim 1 has been amended to include the additional limitations of claim 7, and claim 9 has been amended to include the additional limitations of claim 15. Both claims 1 and 9, as amended, now recite the limitation of "the time shift is longer than the propagation delay on each of the reused channels so as to prevent simultaneous arrival of signals on reused channels." Neither Johnson nor Katz disclose, suggest or imply such a limitation. By contrast, Johnson teaches synchronization of time slots in all sectors to within any differences in propagation delays (see col. 6, lines 56-59 of Johnson) indicating that any difference in propagation delay are not taken into account in the timing adjustments. Katz, on the other hand, is concerned with how to make transmissions spatially directional to an approximate extent (see Abstract of Katz). Angular spread of a signal is varied dependent upon an estimate of distance to the mobile provided by the timing advance information (see page 4, lines 17-21 and page 5, lines 7-15 of Katz). A time shift (timing advance information) is used to ensure a signal transmitted from the mobile to the base station falls within its allotted time slot (page 5, lines 10-13 and page 19, lines 24-26 of Katz). Specifically, if the mobile is far away, the mobile is instructed by the base station to send its data burst earlier than if the mobile is close to the base station (page 19, lines 28-31 of Katz). Accordingly, it is felt that claims 1 and 9, and claims 6, 8, 14 and 16-18 which depend upon either claim 1 or 9, are patentable under 35 USC §103(a) over Johnson in view of Katz.

Serial No. 09/737,640

Claims 2-3, 5, 10-11 and 13 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson in view of Katz and Falco. Claims 2-3, 5, 10-11 and 13 depend upon, and include all the limitations of, either claim 1 or 9 and are therefore also felt to be patentable under 35 USC §103(a) over Johnson in view of Katz and Falco for the reasons discussed earlier.

Respectfully submitted,

Hamid Reza Karimi
Alexandr Kuzminskiy
Carlo Luschi
Magnus Sandell
Paul Edward Strauch
Ran-Hong Yan


Ozer M. N. Teitelbaum
Attorney for the Applicants
Reg. No. 36,698
(973)-386-8803

Date: March 1, 2004

Docket Administrator (Room 3J-219)
Lucent Technologies Inc.
101 Crawfords Corner Road
Holmdel, NJ 07733-3030